

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the final Office Action mailed May 17, 2005, and to the Advisory Action mailed August 3, 1995. The submitted claim amendments are, with the exception of claim 16, resubmissions of the amendments in Amendment E, filed July 18, 2005, which were not entered by the Examiner. The amendments and remarks herein respond to the rejections made in the final Office Action, and to the "new matter" issue raised by the Examiner in the Advisory Action.

Claims 10-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Particularly, the Examiner objects to Applicants' replacing "consisting essentially" with: "comprising" in claim 1, line 3; "further includes" in claim 14, line 2; and "further comprises" in claim 16, line 2.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 10 to replace the term "comprising" with "consisting essentially of". Applicants have also amended claim 14 to replace "further includes" with "consists essentially of", but have further amended the claim to more clearly define, among other things, that the liquid monomer and the dye are contained within the binder. Applicants have amended claim 16 to remove "host matrix further comprises", and to define that the liquid monomer is part of a photopolymer system consisting essentially of: the liquid monomer; a crosslinker; an initiator; and a photosensitizer. Finally, claim 17 has been amended to change "monomer" to "liquid monomer", to comply with amended claim 16.

Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments find support in the specification and claims as originally filed, and thus no new matter is believed to be introduced. Applicants further submit that the claims as amended are supported in the specification and claims as originally filed, and thus the claims are believed to comply with the written description requirement.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that the introduction of "pre-polymer mixture" in claim 16 as previously amended raises the issue of new matter, because it is not stated precisely where the wording comes from nor how the monomer being part of a pre-polymer mixture fits into the medium claimed. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 16 to define, among other things, that the liquid monomer is part of a photopolymer system. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification as filed provides clear and direct support for this amendment. Page 14, lines 23 – page 15, line 12 specifically describe "optical recording media" having an inert polymer host in which is suspended a "complete photopolymer system", having a "monomer" (e.g., dipentaerythritol pentaacrylate), a "crosslinker" (e.g., 1-vinyl-2-pyrrolidinone), an "initiator" (e.g., N-phenyl glycine), and a "photosensitizer" (e.g., camphor quinine). The monomer is liquid before it is polymerized. Page 7, lines 5-6, for example, specifically describe a "liquid monomer".

As clearly provided at page 15, lines 9-12, these components, along with others, form a "pre-polymer mixture" (line 9) that is kept in a semi-viscous state. As stated in line 12, "After polymerization, the material becomes solid and inert".

Thus, Applicants believe clear support exists for the submitted amendment to claim 16, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently-pending rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. If the Examiner believes that some other term would be more appropriate than "photopolymer system," the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

As Applicants have addressed all of the stated issues regarding support in the specification for the claims, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-24, and allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner believes that additional issues exist as to the provided support for the amended claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the below-listed number to resolve such issues.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner should call Applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.


Customer No. 24978

August 17, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

P:\DOCS\0321\67680\9E9400.DOC

By



Arik B. Ranson

Registration No. 43,874